On the Narratives and Background Narratives of e-Government

Dirk Draheim
Tallinn University of Technology
Information Systems Group
Akadeemia tee 15A, 12169 Tallinn, Estonia
dirk.draheim@taltech.ee

Keegan McBride
Tallinn University of Technology
Information Systems Group
Akadeemia tee 15A, 12169 Tallinn, Estonia
keegan.mcbride@taltech.ee

Yuri Misnikov
ITMO University
Centre for e-Government Technologies
49 Kronverksky Pr., St. Petersburg, 197101, Russia
misnikov@egov-center.ru

Florian Hartleb
Catholic University of Eichstätt
Faculty for Social Work
Ostenstraße 26, 85072 Eichstätt, Germany
florian.hartleb@ku.ee @taltech.ee

Mihkel Lauk
PricewaterhouseCoopers
Pärnu mnt 15, 10141 Tallinn, Estonia
mihkel.lauk@ee.pwc.com

Florian Lemke
Capgemini Germany
Business & Technology Solutions Public Sector
Potsdamer Platz 5, 10785 Berlin, Germany
florian.lemke@capgemini.com

Takehiko Nagumo
Kyoto University
School of Management
Yoshida Honmachi, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan
ytakehiko.nagumo@murc.jp

Ingrid Pappel
Tallinn University of Technology
Information Systems Group
Akadeemia tee 15A, 12169 Tallinn, Estonia
ingrid.pappel@taltech.ee

Abstract

In this paper, key narratives within the field of e-government are identified by conducting a thematic analysis of the top 100 most cited e-government papers (plus an additional 20 from 2018-2019). The identified narratives that emerged from this analysis are: the democratic, technocratic, and the tech-savvy narrative, plus the implementation (pseudo) narrative. This paper explores and provides theoretical reflections on these narratives by anchoring them in established background paradigms, such as open society and new public management.

1. Introduction

As digital technologies continue to play an increasing role in our everyday life, and government continue to adopt technology into their day-to-day processes in their pursuit of "digital transformation", something behind-the-scenes is also happening; that is, the interpretation of what digital government actually *means*. This process of interpreting and understanding is important as it is also well understood that our mental models of reality influence the decisions we make, and that this mental model is influenced by our unique context, beliefs, and traditions [1, 2]. Thus, different mental models, different understandings, different contexts, may all lead to different conceptualizations about the ontological nature of digital government. While this has implications for society at large, it is also important for the developing scholarly field of digital government to understand the different interpretations and discourses at play as it is not possible to explain until an initial understanding is generated. Thus, this paper starts with the idea that within the current research paradigm of digital government, scholars do not yet agree, or perhaps even know, the different narratives and discourses that are at play and influence the rapidly expanding body of literature and knowledge on the topic.

To a large degree these depend on discourses – and their actors – unfolding in particular sub-disciplines. Scrutinizing the language of such discourse narratives should provide additional entry points for developing

URI: https://hdl.handle.net/10125/63999
978-0-9981331-3-3
(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

a deeper understanding of digital government narratives that drive both research and practice. The advantage of looking at digital government research scholarship and it's discourse structures is that it potentially allows for exploiting a well-developed repertoire of discourse analysis instruments that help revealing the intended meaning of the discursively constructed narratives of academic texts, including those that dominate the overall digital government discourse at large.

To this end, we apply the notion of the *critical discourse analysis* (CDA) advanced by many media, communications and language scholars. Specifically, in this paper we follow Norman Fairclough's [3, 4] definition of the term *discourse* (within the critical tradition). While there is no shortage of academic papers reporting on a diverse range of e-government research (see, for example, the widely known discussions by Heeks and Bailur [5], Bekkers and Hombug [6], and Yilidz and Saylam [7]) in general, there has been little to no efforts made to systematically review how the results of digital government research fit within their discourse narratives. This is surprising, as the vast majority of digital government research is trans-disciplinary in nature which, thus, requires their research to start by offering a specific explanatory viewpoint that helps to frame their research within a certain discourse narrative, tradition, or context. As these narratives do not only provide information about a specific discipline or background, but also about the research motivation, research design, research hypotheses, research questions, research methods, and their interpretations of results, it is of the utmost importance that a more in-depth analysis of these discourses is conducted.

Taking into account the interpretivist epistemological stance and the identified importance of narratives for developing digital government research as a scholarly discipline, this paper starts from asking the simple question:

What are the core narratives and discourses associated with digital government?

While many approaches, theoretically, would allow for this research question to be answered, such as through interviews or Delphi studies, it was decided that a better starting point would be to work in an inductive manner, starting with a comprehensive literature review of the most cited papers in digital government, and then continuing on with the critical discourse analysis method as proposed by Fairclough [3, 4]. For this research, the top 100 most cited papers in digital government (plus an additional 20 top-cited papers published between 2018 and 2019), were selected for the study.

At the start of the research, two narratives were clear: the *democratic* and a *technocratic*. However, as the research progressed, two other narratives made themselves known. Firstly, the *tech-savvy* narrative, which is self-sufficient and draws from pure techno-progressivism, and moves from the transformation of government to the technological transformation of global society. The second identified narrative was that of *implementation*, this narrative is heavily based within *engineering* perspectives and argues that every problem can be solved or engineered, it focuses heavily on the implementation (typically emphasizing a *holistic* implementation perspective that equally encompasses efforts with respect to policy making, technological infrastructure and organizational change management) ignoring the environmental forces that effect all digital government projects (motivation/rationales, legitimation, societal impact etc.). This narrative is more of a pseudo narrative in that it points to an apparent disconnect between digital government hands-on, down-to-earth *craftmenship* practice and interpretative theorizing – the latter is a necessary condition to qualify as a narrative. As this pseudo narrative seems ubiquitous in the e-government discipline, we opt to treat it as a narrative as well arriving at a generic compound formula of 3+1 digital narratives: three core *genuine* narratives and one non-core *pseudo* narrative.

The previously disclosed narratives are the first major contribution to the current digital government scholarly debate. A second contribution is the discussion of these narratives in an in-depth manner as well as relating specific digital government concepts to their specific narratives; this should, hypothetically, allow for future theoretical development using the inductively derived discourses as a theoretical foundation.

In order to arrive at these contributions and present the conducted research, the paper proceeds as following. In section 2, an overview of previous research is provided which is discussed in a narrow sense, i.e., paper and work that aim to answer the same or similar research questions. In section 3, the methodology is discussed and presented. In sections 4 through 7 each individual identified narrative is discussed and, finally, in section 8 the paper concludes with future research directions and the main contributions of the paper highlighted.

2. Related Work

Within the research area of e-government, there has been previous work that aims to understand the different narratives or discourses of e-government,

however these are often specific to a given context rather than the research area of e-government itself. For example, Yildiz and Salam [7] aim to identify discourses associated with e-government in Turkish newspapers by following an inductive approach. The authors identify nine discourses, five positive and four negative, with a large majority (74 of 98) being associated with the discourse of government reform, or, in other words, the authors claim that Turkey's NPM (New Public Management) [8] reforms highly influenced the discourse of e-government within Turkey [7]. In a similar vein, McNeal et al. [9] attempt to understand why there is different levels of e-government uptake among different US states, and claim that digitalization is primarily driven in a top-down approach, for the sake of reform [9]. Other research, such as Gauld et al. [10] and Moon and Welch [11] also find similar results in their studies, e-government should be viewed as a transformative or administrative reform process, with different perceptions and beliefs about it amongst the stakeholders (e-government is different for citizens than it is for bureaucrats). These works, or the discourses identified them, would fall within what we term the *technocratic narrative*.

In regards to the *democratic narrative*, a large amount of research has been devoted to the topic. For example, within the e-government research community there are whole conferences devoted to the study of e-government and e-Democracy, such as eVoteID and CeDEM (now part of EGovEPart). Here, there is a strong emphasis on the role of e-government in driving or encouraging democratic change and/or e-participation through the adoption of technology such as i-Voting or through technology facilitated participation. Throughout the development of e-government as a research discipline, this narrative has been one of the most common occurring motifs and one of the highest praised benefits and yet, even still, some have noted that e-government "has not been an agent of e-Democracy or e-Transformation" and is rather "mainly informational" and service oriented [12]. This is, of course, interesting, and in fact now the same technology that was highlighted as having the potential to radically change or transform our democratic processes are now being shown to have negative unanticipated emergent behavior, such as the rise in fake news being spread over social media.

Thirdly, comes the *tech-savvy* narrative, which is quite often, the most criticized. This narrative is often associated with techno-centrism and positivism and is often looked down upon for failing to take into account the systemic nature of e-government. For example, research conducted by Heeks and Bailur [5], have found that papers within this narrative are often subjective, self-promoting, and lack rigor. Though this narrative does face resistance from many scholars, it remains popular, and, to some extent, is needed, as disruptive technologies are not well understood by many, and thorough descriptive analysis of these technologies is indeed beneficial for scholars and practitioners alike.

While it has been clear for some time that there are different narrative present within e-government research, papers that deal with these narratives often fall short of analyzing how objects of study within the field map to these narratives. For example, Bekkers and Homburg 2007 [6] write on "The Myths of e-Government" and discuss how narratives and myths seem to play an important role in driving eGovernment development. In a more recent paper, Meijer and Bekkers 2015 [13] propose a *meta theory* of e-government consisting of three different dimensions. This meta theory can be used to classify e-government papers based on their methodological goals and ontological assumptions about e-government. Though much of this previous research has paid attention to the use of theory or research philosophy to classify e-government research, the importance of narratives and discourses should not be forgotten, as our narratives influence our understanding of the world. Thus, by clearly identifying the main narratives within e-government research, it becomes easier to generate an understanding of e-government as a research area and is an important part of creating the foundation for future development of the eGovernment research field.

3. Methodology

Methodologically, this research started with an initial literature review of the 100 top cited papers within digital government literature. However, since none of these top 100 papers were published after 2016 the top 20 most cited papers between 2016 and 2018 were also included in the analysis to ensure that the study included up-to-date information. These papers were found by searching the Scopus database on May 2019 with the simple string 'e-government' in the title, abstract, and keywords. This initial search yielded 12,056 documents, yet only the top 100 eligible most cited were kept. For the purpose of this study, an eligible paper was written in English, was available on Scopus, was published within the domain of digital government (this is verified by cross checking papers with the Digital Government Reference Library, version 14.5 which included 11,211 references).

Following the initial collection and creation of a corpus of texts for the research, we apply the discourse analysis tools, such as content coding, to reveal respective discourse narratives[1]. In doing so, we turn to Norman Fairclough, of the most prominent scholar in the field of discourse analysis [3, 4]. He defines discourse as a mode of communicating action, a form of social practice by using a particular use of language that enables communication actors to "act upon the world and especially upon each other" [3] (p.63). That is, the language is used beyond the actors' individually or situationally motivated representational interests. It is rather about communicating social practices as discourse events and studying the social effects of discourse events (under the critical tradition). A discursively (i.e., via a particular use of language and respective communication medium) constructed event can be imagined as a three-dimensional model comprising (a) linguistic objects, such as written texts, (b) an instance of communicative practice, such as the processes of text production and interpretation, and (c) a case of social practice, such as the underlying institutional and organisational circumstances accompanying the event [3] (p.4). Discourse analysis, from this perspective, is not limited by the linguistic analysis of sentences and other smaller language units. It focuses on supra-linguistic *text-and-interaction* discourse properties, as a means to represent *aspects of the world*, in our case the e-government world.

Fairclough, with reference to Teun van Dijk, another prominent discourse analyst (founder of *Discourse & Society* journal), further argues that textual analysis can be split into (a) linguistic analysis and (b) intertextual analysis [4]. This means that the text is analyzed beyond words and sentences alone since "Whereas linguistic analysis shows how texts selectively draw upon linguistic system [...], intertextual analysis shows how texts selectively draw upon *orders of discourse* – the particular configurations of conventionalized practices (genres, discources, narratives, etc) which are available for text producers and interpreters in particular social circumstances" [4] (p. 188). Accordingly, writing and exchanging text is regarded as a discourse genre, as an intertextual narrative emerging as a result of text exchanges on the part of text producers. In relation to the discipline of e-government, academic scholarship is intertextual by default as each research draws on one another, but draws selectively, as Fairclough underlines, to show specific preferences of specific authors in particular circumstances of governance and country-specific contexts.

Overall, Norman Fairclough's concept of critical discourse analysis methods is built on Michael Halliday's System Functional Linguistics (SFL), a linguistic theory, in which analytical methods aim at disclosing the social character of linguistic texts, also employs similar terms like meaning. This has a clearly discursive nature as either (a) *knowledge exchanges* (when information is exchanged) or (b) *activity exchanges* (when an action is presumed on the recipient's side) and convey, respectively, either statements/questions or offers/demands.

Jørgensen and Phillips [14] (p.89) think that "Fairclough, in our view, constructed the most sophisticated framework for analysis of the relationship between language use and societal practices in general" – in terms of the consequences of the discursively communicated theoretical distinctions for empirical research (most of the e-government scholarship is empirical research). Otherwise speaking, social practices become discursive when communicated as linguistic (textual) narratives. However, placing the emphasis on social events (practices), the tool-box of discourse analysis does not mention or address technological practices or the combination of bother, for that matter, which is our main concern. Despite that, Fairclough's understanding of discourse genres, orders and event-based fabula, such as stories and narratives, is applicable in our view for researching e-government-related academic discourses, including testing the applicability towards technology-related discourse narratives. Revealing them would help associate discursive fabula of academic e-government texts – narrative genres – with certain real-life events falling under the above-described democratic, technocratic, tech-savvy and implementation narratives.

This initial analysis of the papers in the study corpus led to 68 coding results, grouped into 7 (main) themes, with 1,400 codings total (plus further 18 codes in 5 auxiliary themes and 73 auxiliary codings). However, it is important to note that only the title, abstract, and introduction of the included papers were coded as it was assumed that the digital government narrative of a paper should become clear, at the latest, by the end of the introduction. An initial overview of these codes, grouped into their assigned narratives, is shown in Table 1 (the count in the first column is the number of papers where the code was found and in the second column is the total occurrence of the specific code). The central themes in Table 1 are *Democrative Narrative*, *Technocratic Narrative*, *Tech-*

[1] We provide all data gathered for this research paper (the list of included and excluded references, bibliographic meta data, and the full list of our codings, i.e., text extracts, codes, themes and categories) for download from the project web page: *http://narratives.egovlab.org*

Table 1. Codes given for the top 100 and top 20(>2017) e-government papers on behalf of thematic analysis, decreasingly ordered by number of papers in which each code was given at least once (plus total number of occurences); grouped by themes.

Democratic Narrative		
citizen participation	39	(63)
increase transparency	31	(85)
trust in government	17	(26)
strengthen democracy	17	(24)
social inclusion	8	(10)
care for Grand challenges	6	(8)
e-governmemt as national asset	2	(4)
open society	2	(4)
social activities	2	(3)
social innovation	1	(1)
Democratic/Technocratic Narrative		
citizen orientation	46	(68)
increase accountability	19	(26)
citizen empowerment	10	(11)
co-production	8	(19)
good governance	7	(8)
Technocratic Narrative		
increase efficiency	66	(130)
increase quality	43	(62)
increase effectiveness	42	(71)
new public management (implicitly given)	37	(52)
PPP	32	(45)
citizen as customer	27	(43)
service innovation	21	(24)
increase reactivness	17	(20)
e-governmemt assessment	12	(17)
increase reach	11	(14)
availability	6	(7)
economic growth	5	(7)
new public management (explicitly given)	5	(10)
slim state	1	(2)
Tech-Savvy Narrative		
transformation of government	35	(54)
technological progressivism	27	(32)
disruption of society	5	(5)
disruption of daily lives and work	3	(4)
technology first	1	(1)

Political Debate		
digital divide	9	(17)
anti-corruption	8	(32)
loss of privacy	6	(7)
social change	5	(7)
increasing control	3	(4)
anti-fraud	2	(4)
political activism	2	(2)
developing countries	1	(5)
legitimation of e-government	1	(1)

Tech-Savvy/Implementation Narrative		
social media	5	(16)
AI	1	(2)
big data, data sciene	1	(4)
multimedia	1	(1)
Implementation Narrative		
acceptance / adoption	30	(63)
proposing best practices	29	(55)
change management	25	(37)
trust in e-services	20	(29)
holistic endeavor	16	(22)
usefulness	12	(13)
law and policies	11	(16)
ease of use	10	(11)
security	10	(10)
technical systems	10	(26)
obstacles in general	9	(17)
maturity	7	(11)
sufficient funding	7	(9)
implementation (general)	4	(4)
satisfaction with e-services	3	(6)
system quality	2	(2)
ultra-large scale system	2	(2)
cultural differences	1	(2)
legacy process integration	1	(1)
risk management	1	(1)
top-level support	1	(1)

Savvy Narrative and *Implementation Narrative*. The identified narratives cannot be strictly separated from each other, but, rather they are anchor points in a narrative spectrum. This shows also at the level of codes. Some codes support both the democratic as well as the technocratic narrative. For those we have introduced a theme *Democrative/Technocratic Narrative*. Similarly, we introduced a theme *TechSavvy/Technocratic Narrative*. The codes in the theme *Political Debate* open (or should be considered in the context of) a wider political debate. Depending on the context, they can be used to support the democratic or the technocratic narrative.

4. The Technocratic eGov Narrative

The technocratic e-government narrative is the e-government narrative *per se*. It somehow dominates the academic literature and, when it comes to implementations of digital initiatives, stakeholders act and think mainly in the categories of this narrative. From the beginning, when the term *electronic government* was used by Al Gore more than twenty years ago in 1997 [15], e-government was about the ideal that "the productivity of government operations will be soaring" [15]. In [15], the tradition of the Minnowbrook public administration movement [16] is still visible, e.g., when it praises electronic government as a means to overcome the machine organization (in the sense of Henry Mintzberg [17]) of governmental administrations. Over two decades, the technocratic narrative seems to meander between the democratic values of the Minnowbrook new public administration (NPA) and the strictly managerial values of the new public management (NPM) movement [8]; which also explains why we needed to introduce an intermediate

theme *Democratic/Technocratic Narrative* in our coding endevors – compare with Table 1.

Citizen orientation is an essential ingredient of both NPA and NPM. But NPA is a also counter-programme to the dictate of efficiency and effectiveness [18]; and, therefore, the technocratic narrative can be eventually decided to reside in the realm of NPM, as is it clearly dominated by an orientation towards increased efficiency and effectiveness.

We find that the chosen name of the technocratic narrative as *technocratic* is particularly appropriate against the background of today's understanding of technocrats. In a narrow sense, technocracy is about having experts as high-level political decision makers (policy makers). In a broader sense it is a political paradigm shift [19] towards a rather *naive* positivism. However, advocates of technocracy – who might be found in global elite organizations such as the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and regional authorities such as parliaments and political parties alike – need not to be experts themselves. What remains is strong orientation towards efficiency and effectiveness that renders the other ingredients of the technocratic narrative such as citizen orientation and quality of services rather second class, into a form of additional justification for planned transformations of the administration. This also makes the technocratic narrative to appear – superficially – as an a-political narrative. But it is not. Given the mere seize of the public sector, each transformation of it has political impact – even if we do not take the latent functions of the public sector into consideration. Such impact is hard to predict, but in practical transformations, such impact is surely often wanted as part of a more unofficial agenda.

The technocratic narrative heavily borrows from today's mainstream management system. Today's mainstream management is about considering the organization as a *recursive feedback-control system* – with negotiated KPIs (key performance indicators) at each hierarchical level. Such characterization is not an oversimplification, actually, it is the essence of all process-oriented ISO management systems such as ISO 9000, ISO 37000, ISO 22301, ISO 27000 etc.etc. Also, it is the least common nominator of other leading management systems such as TQM (Total Quality Management) and BSC (Balanced Scorecard) [20, 21] and, furthermore, compatible with the several possible organizational structures (compare with Henry Mintzberg [17]) and cultures (compare with Edgar Schein [22]).

Today's mainstream management is the heritage of systems theory. Here, it can be seen a similar path from democratic to purely managarial values as we have seen in the above discussion on NPA vs. NPM. In the very beginning, Norbert Wiener's system theory [23, 24] was deeply driven by democratic values. With the Viable System Model [25, 26], the organization receives the design of a *recursive feedback-control system* in its clearest form (in the 1970s [27]). When the Viable System Model was applied to Chile by Salvador Allende in 1971, it was the first fully elaborated e-government infrastructure (Cybernet) and system (Cybersyn) of the world [28]. What has been implemented by Cybersyn was even way more than the basic e-government services we are used to; it was a form of real-time communism (real-time socialist planning economy). If compared to Chile's system, called "Fanfare of Effective Freedom" by Stafford Beer [27], today's technocratic e-government narrative appears to us as almost completely a-political. But we have said: is is not. And visions such as the *real-time economy* again transcend e-government from basic PPP (public private partnership) into something bigger.

5. The Democratic eGov Narrative

The democratic eGov narrative is about the *citizen as a citizen*, and not, as it is in the technocratic narrative, about the *citizen as a customer*. In that narrative, citizens aim at participation, social inclusion and want to help their neighbors. They want to trust their government, but not in its own right, however, because they want to be connected, embedded in the state. The state is not merely a service or a service platform; it is the channel through which people are *connected*.

In the democratic narrative, citizens enjoy *passive* and *active* freedom. They are not controlled (and do not control their neighbors). They enjoy opportunities in regards their education, health and wealth.

The grand narrative of the democratic e-government narrative *per se* is the *open society* in the tradition of Karl Popper [29]. And, the intrinsic values of Norbert Wiener's system theory (*cybernetics*) [23, 24] are surely in line with the democratic narrative. New public management shapes the administration after managerial values; whereas, the *Minnowbrook public administration* [16, 18] shapes the administration after democratic values. Therefore, the NPA needs surely to be considered a background narrative of the democratic e-government narrative also.

6. The Tech-Savvy eGov Narrative

The tech-savvy narrative shows two important characteristics. First, it shows a high level self-sufficiency. Second, it steps from the transformation of governmental administration to the transformation of the whole government or the whole society.

The following arguments are the most typical ones in the tech-savvy narrative:

- Latest IT technology is used with huge success in today's businesses; therefore, we need to use IT also to transform public administrations.
- e-Government is established all around the world with high pressure; therefore, we also need to establish it in our country.
- IT technology is available; therefore, we need to use it to transform public administrations.

Such arguments appear in 27 out of the top100/top20 papers that we have investigated. They express a kind of *technological progressivism*, i.e., the technological progression itself it taken as a justification for conducting digital transformation of governments.

Furthermore, the tech-savvy narrative stresses the potential of technology to transform not only the governmental administration, but also the whole government or the society. Some example satements are:

- *"They also predict that e-government will fundamentally transform the relationship between governments and citizens."* [30]
- *"The Internet is one communication tool that has the potential to radically change the face of government in the 21st century."* [31]
- *"It would also lead to an end state that would include the integration of information and service delivery both within and among governments, would transform governments themselves, would fundamentally transform relations between governments and the governed, and, ultimately, would produce electronic democracy."* [31]

It needs to be admitted that, in the scientific literature that we have investigated for this paper (the top100 and top20 papers), arguments about the transformation of the government or society somehow remain down-to-earth; i.e., they seem to be more a rhetoric figure and stay inside the parameters that are also discussed in the other two genuine narratives. However, in general, i.e., in the media and in certain sub cultures, tech-savvy argumentation can be quite far-reaching.

Take the case of blockchain technology as an example (see [32] for a systematic literature review on the application of blockchain technology in the area of e-government). First, many of the existing e-government blockchain projects might not be accepted as *real* blockchain implementations by the hard core blockchain community, i.e., whenever the "blockchain" project is merely about the implementation of a classic audit log (without distributed ledger and without consensus mechanism) that is just named a blockchain due to marketing reasons. However, the vision of *smart contract*, together with the notion of the DAO (Decentralized Autonomous Organization), is a deeply disruptive vision: the vision encompasses and actually needs a completely new society and, actually, political system (M0/–/Mn money is completely replaced by cryptocurrency, a society without legislative etc.) Such story cannot be anchored any more in established background narratives, it needs to serve as its own background narrative or needs to be associated with some sub cultural narrative such as *liberterian anarachism* or contemporary/emerging narrative such as *transhumanism* [33]; now, we have fully arrived in the global postmodern condition *à la* Lyotard [34].

7. The Implementation Pseudo-Narrative

The implementation narrative is even more self-sufficient than the tech-savvy narrative. It deals, *in medias res* with the challenges of establishing e-government. Here, it stresses that e-government is *not at all only about technology*, but rather a holistic endeavor that needs to integrate laws, regulations, change management and technology. Often, it is also stressed that technology is particularly challenging in e-government projects, due to the size/complexity of the systems and, in particular, due to particularly important IT security issues. As such, the implementation narrative is very similar to the standard story told by IT companies that apply to public procurement tenders in e-government. There are two kinds of research endeavors that exploit the implementation narrative and then become integral part of the told implementation story. The first is about investigating the acceptance of a certain e-government initiative; the second it about proposing best practices (typically, in the form of a maturity model) for e-government implementation.

The implementation narrative can be teamed to-

gether with the three other narratives, as such, we say that it is rather a pseudo narrative. However, given the pervasiveness of this narrative, it is almost impossible, to ignore it.

8. Conclusion

This paper had two primary goals. Firstly, to identify the key narratives, discourses, stories, and motifs that have and continue to appear within eGovernment scholarly literature. When it comes to qualitative research areas, of which e-government is, the identification of narratives can help to gather a stronger sense of understanding, which is necessary for continued development of the field. Through our thematic coding analysis of papers within the e-government domain, four primary narratives appeared: democratic, technocratic, tech-savvy, and implementation. Though each narrative exists on their own, the borders are sometimes amorphous, with some overlap and interaction occurring between narratives. However, what is clear, is that each narrative can be associated or mapped to specific ontological ideas and normative values about e-government. This is important as it allows for future research to begin to theorize, understand, and study the different ontological and epistemological questions and positions within the field of e-government, and nest that research within the identified narratives.

This research is likely to be of interest for eGovernment scholars, as it provides a different lens for understanding and analyzing literature and research within the field of e-government. Though the conducted research identified four primary narratives of e-government research, it does not draw out specific normative value statements associated with each one. Thus, future research could be conducted to draw out and clarify intrinsic characteristics associated with each narrative.

References

[1] D. H. Meadows, *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2008.

[2] W. J. Orlikowski and J. J. Baroudi, "Studying information technology in organizations: Research approaches and assumptions," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 1991.

[3] N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.

[4] N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Routledge, 2013.

[5] R. Heeks and S. Bailur, "Analyzing e-government research: Perspectives, philosophies, theories, methods, and practice," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 243–265, 2007.

[6] V. Bekkers and V. Homburg, "The myths of e-government: Looking beyond the assumptions of a new and better government," *Information Society*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 373–382, 2007.

[7] M. Yildiz and A. Saylam, "E-government discourses: An inductive analysis," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 141 – 153, 2013.

[8] C. Hood, "A public management for all seasons?," *Public Administration*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 3–19, 1991.

[9] R. McNeal, C. Tolbert, K. Mossberger, and L. Dotterweich, "Innovating in digital government in the American States," *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 52–70, 2003.

[10] R. Gauld, S. Goldfinch, and S. Horsburgh, "Do they want it? do they use it? the 'demand-side' of e-government in Australia and New Zealand," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 177–186, 2010.

[11] M. J. Moon and E. W. Welch, "Same bed, different dreams? a comparative analysis of citizen and bureaucrat perspectives on e-government," *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 243–264, 2005.

[12] D. F. Norris, "E-government 2020: Plus a change, plus c'est la meme chose," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 180–181, 2010.

[13] A. Meijer and V. Bekkers, "A metatheory of e-government: Creating some order in a fragmented research field," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 237–245, 2015.

[14] M. W. Jørgensen and L. J. Phillips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage, 2002.

[15] Al Gore, *Access America: Reengineering Through Information Technology – Report of the National Performance Review and the Government Information Technology Services Board*. Vice President of the United States, 1997.

[16] R. O'Leary, D. M. Van Slyke, and S. Kim, *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Georgetown University Press, 2010.

[17] H. Mintzberg, *Mintzberg on Management: Inside our Strange World of Organizations*. Free Press, 1980.

[18] D. Waldo, *The Administrative State*. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

[19] H. Elsner, *The Technocrats: Prophets of Automation*. Syracuse University Press, 1967.

[20] R. S. Kaplan and D. P. Norton, "The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. January-February, pp. 71–79, 1992.

[21] R. S. Kaplan, L. K. Johnson, R. A. Archer, and T. Nagumo, "Balanced Scorecard Report, November/December 2002," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 4, no. 6, 2002.

[22] E. H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass, 2010.

[23] N. Wiener, *Cybernetics – or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. New York: John Wiley, 1948.

[24] N. Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings*. Houghton Mifflin, 1950.

[25] S. Beer, *The Heart of Enterprise – Companion Volume to: The Brain of the Firm*. John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

[26] S. Beer, *The Brain of the Firm – Companion Volume to:The Heart of Enterprise*. John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

[27] S. Beer, "Fanfare for effective management – cybernetic praxis in government." The 3rd Richard Goodman Memorial Lecture, Delivered at Brighton Polytechnic, Moulsecoomb, Brighton, 14th February 1973.

[28] E. Miller, "Designing Freedom, Regulating a Nation – Socialist Cybernetics in Allende's Chile," Tech. Rep. Working Paper #34, Massachusetts Institute ofTechnology, January 2002.

[29] K. R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies, vol. 1 & 2*. Routledge, 1945.

[30] D. Coursey and D. Norris, "Models of e-government: Are they correct? an empirical assessment," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 523–536, 2008.

[31] C. Reddick, "Citizen interaction with e-government: From the streets to servers?," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 38–57, 2005.

[32] F. Batubara, J. Ubacht, and M. Janssen, "Challenges of blockchain technology adoption for e-government: A systematic literature review," in *Proceeding of dg.o'18 – the 19th Annual Intl. Conf. on Digital Government Research: Governance in the Data Age*, ACM, 2018.

[33] N. Bostrom, "A history of transhumanist thought," *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 2005.

[34] J.-F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University of Minneapolis Press, 1984.